



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,674	05/23/2005	Bianca Brogmann	085742-0487	1884
20277 7590 09/15/2010 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			EXAMINER JEAN-LOUIS, SAMIRA JM	
			ART UNIT 1627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/15/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,674

Applicant(s)

BROGMANN ET AL.

Examiner

SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS

Art Unit

1627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/06/10.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

This Office Action is in response to the amendment submitted on 07/06/10. Claims 45-58 are currently pending in the application, with claims 1-44 having being cancelled. Accordingly, claims 45-58 are being examined on the merits herein.

Receipt of Applicant's remarks and Declaration is acknowledged and has been entered.

Applicant's traversal of the provisional ODP rejections of claims 45 and 47-58 over claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-17, 43-46, and 48-49 of copending application 10/510,673 and of claims 45-46, 49-51, and 57 over claims 27, 39-47, and 50-52 of copending Application No. 11/885,288 is acknowledged, but since applicant did not put forth any arguments against this rejection, the ODP rejections are maintained for reasons of record as stated in the previous office action and re-stated below for applicant's convenience. Moreover, given that the Terminal Disclaimer filed by applicant on 07/26/10 was disapproved, the ODP rejections are maintained.

Applicant's argument with respect to the 103 (a) rejection has been fully considered. Applicant argues that the Declaration provided by Dr. Hopp supports the fact that the instant claims recite critical dosage amounts and active ingredient weight ratios which minimize GI side effects without compromising the beneficial analgesic

effect while the prior art teaches a wide range of ratios without specifically pointing out the criticality of any ratio. Applicant further argues that Meissner et al. demonstrated the effectiveness of the single ratio of 2:1 of oxycodone to naloxone and that such ratio led to an improved bowel function while maintaining the same analgesic effect. Such arguments are not however found persuasive as the Examiner maintains that the prior art still renders obvious applicant's invention. Though applicant is claiming the use of a single ratio, the Examiner contends that the ratio of 2:1 is rendered obvious by Kaiko who teaches the combination of oxycodone to naloxone in a 2.5:1 ratio and by Pachter who clearly teaches the use of oxycodone to naloxone in a ratio of 2-20:1. While Meissner et al. demonstrated that a ratio of 2:1 was more effective in improving bowel function, the Examiner maintains that such unexpected results is not compared against the closest prior art. Nowhere in Meissner was the ratio of 2.5:1 tested against the 2:1 ratio. While applicant tested a ratio of 1:1, 1.5:1, 2:1 and 3:1, etc., the Examiner reminds applicant that an affidavit or declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 must compare the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art to be effective to rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Burckel*, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979). Consequently, the Examiner contends that applicant has not rebutted the *prima facie* case of obviousness established by the Examiner. As a result, the Examiner maintains that Kaiko in view of Pachter still renders obvious applicant's instant claims.

As for applicant's arguments that one of ordinary skill in the art wouldn't reasonably predict that the claimed 2:1 ratio is the optimal critical ratio, the Examiner maintains that applicant has not demonstrated that such dosage was in fact critical

since such comparison was not made over Kaiko, the closest prior art. The Examiner reminds applicant that a determination of obviousness relies on what a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have known at the time of the invention and on what such a person would have reasonably expected to have been able to do in view of that knowledge. Because Meissner et al. were not available at the time of the invention, the Examiner contends that one skilled in the art would have followed the teachings of the prior art and would have reasonably utilized the ratios proffered by Kaiko and Pachter to be useful in providing analgesic effects.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejections of record remain proper and are maintained. They are being made Final and re-stated below for applicant's convenience.

Provisional Non-Statutory Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 45 and 47-58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 12-17, 43-46, and 48-49 of copending Application No. 10/510,673 (hereinafter Brogmann US Patent Application No. '673). Although the conflicting claims are not completely identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications are directed to a pharmaceutical formulation comprising a combination of oxycodone and/or its pharmaceutically acceptable salts, and naloxone and/or its pharmaceutically acceptable salts, the combination in a controlled release matrix containing ethylcellulose and at least one fatty alcohol and providing for a sustained release formulation. The

claimed invention and co-pending application Brogmann '673 are rendered obvious over another as the claimed invention teaches a subgenus of active agents which include oxycodone and naloxone released from a controlled release matrix whereas Brogmann '674 teaches a broad genus of pharmaceutically active agents that are released from a non-swellable diffusion matrix and thus obvious over one another. Thus, the aforementioned claims of the instant application are substantially overlapping in scope as discussed hereinabove and are prima facie obvious over the cited claims of corresponding application No. 10/510,673.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 45-46, 49-51, and 57 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27, 39-47, and 50-52 of copending Application No. 11/885,288 (hereinafter Leyendecker US Patent Application No. '288). Although the conflicting claims are not completely identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications are directed to a pharmaceutical formulation comprising a combination of oxycodone and/or its pharmaceutically acceptable salts, and naloxone and/or its pharmaceutically acceptable salts, the combination in a controlled release matrix containing ethylcellulose and at least one fatty alcohol and providing for a sustained release formulation. The claimed invention and co-pending application Leyendecker '288 are rendered obvious

over another as the claimed invention is silent on the pharmacokinetic profile of the composition whereas Leyendecker '288 teaches a composition with a T_{max} for oxycodone of about 1 to about 17 hours. While the instant invention is silent on the pharmacokinetic profile of oxycodone, the Examiner maintains that the instant invention would possess the same pharmacokinetic profile as Leyendecker as both the instant and co-pending applications contain the same exact ingredients. Thus, the aforementioned claims of the instant application are substantially overlapping in scope as discussed hereinabove and are prima facie obvious over the cited claims of corresponding application No. 11/885,288.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kaiko et al. (WO 99/32119, previously cited) in view of Pachter et al. (U.S. 3,773,955, previously cited).

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Kaiko et al. teach an oral dosage form comprising a combination of an orally analgesically effective amount of an opioid agonist and an orally active opioid antagonist, the opioid being included in a ratio to the opioid agonist to provide a combination product which is analgesically effective when the combined oral dosage is administered but is aversive in physically dependent subject (instant claim 57; see abstract, pg. 6, lines 28-30, pg. 7, lines 6-8, and pg. 8, lines 5-10). Additionally, Kaiko et al. teach that the dosage forms of the invention can be provided as a sustained release of the opioid agonist and all of the doses of opioid antagonist via the incorporation of a sustained release carrier into a matrix containing the opioid agonist and antagonist; or via a sustained release coating of a matrix containing the opioid agonist and antagonist (instant claim 45; see pg. 10, lines 6-15 and pg. 23, lines 6-10). As the opioid antagonist, Kaiko et al. teach the use of naloxone, where the amount of naloxone included in the dosage form being large enough to provide an equiantagonistic effect as

if naltrexone (i.e. another opioid antagonist) were included in the combination (instant claim 45; see pg. 14, lines 15-18). Moreover, Kaiko et al. teach that small doses of 0.4-0.8 mg and up to 24 mg of naloxone in man have been found effective to reverse the effects of opioid agonists (instant claim 45; see pg. 13, lines 21-25). As for the opioid analgesics (i.e. agonists) that are useful in the invention, Kaiko et al. teach the use of several agonists, mixed agonist-antagonists, with oxycodone or pharmaceutically acceptable salts or esters thereof being among the preferred ones that can be administered at an equianalgesic dose of 13.5 mg or a dosages of about 2.5 mg to about 800 mg (instant claims 45-46; see pg. 11, lines 17-20; pg. 15, line 32, pg. 16, lines 11, 15-16 and 23; and pg. 23, lines 17-19). Additionally, Kaiko et al. teach that in the prior art oxycodone-naloxone compositions are known to have a ratio of 2.5-5:1 parts by weight (instant claim 45; see pg. 5, lines 20-22). Moreover, the combination of opioid agonist and opioid antagonist can be employed in admixtures with convention excipients, including carbohydrates or diluents such as lactose (i.e. filler, instant claim 52), magnesium stearate (i.e. lubricant; instant claims 53-54), cornstarch (i.e. flowing agent; instant claim 56; see pg. 19, lines 34-35, pg. 20, lines 5-11, and 19-21; pg. 33, lines 30-32). In the case of oral compositions, the dosage can be provided as tablets, capsules, caplets and gelcaps (instant claim 58; see pg. 9, lines 30-33; pg. 20, lines 14-16, pg. 23, lines 6-10). Suitable sustained release formulations and coatings which may be used include the use of alkylcellulose polymers which provide hydrophobic materials including ethylcellulose or aqueous dispersion of ethylcellulose sold commercially as Surelease (instant claims 45 and 49; see pg. 25, lines 8-10 and 22). Other matrix

formulations include the use of a controlled release matrix that releases the opioid in a pH-dependent or independent manner and includes the use of hydrophobic materials such as fatty acids and fatty alcohols including stearic acid and stearyl alcohol (instant claims 49-51 and 55; see pg. 30, lines 31-35; pg. 31, lines 8-16; pg. 32, lines 10-13 and lines 25-28; and pg. 33, lines 25-27).

Kaiko et al. do not specifically teach a pharmaceutical preparation containing oxycodone-naloxone with the weight ratio of 2:1 or a preparation in the form of specific pharmaceutically acceptable and equally active free base salts.

Pachter et al. teach orally effective, analgesic composition which does not provide euphoria or physical dependence comprising an oral inactive dose of naloxone and an oral active strong analgetic in oral dosage form and containing for each analgetic dose of the analgetic agent an amount of naloxone sufficient to negate the euphoretic and dependence producing action of the composition (see abstract, and col. 1). Pachter et al. also teach that naloxone is a potent opioid antagonist that can be parenterally used in a dose of 0.1-2.5 mg (see col. 2, lines 40-44 and lines 48). Pachter further teaches that potential analgetics that can be used with naloxone include oxycodone that can be provided in a ratio 2-20 parts to 1 (i.e. 2-20 parts oxycodone to 1 part naloxone) part naloxone to produce an orally effective analgetic composition which does not produce euphoria or physical dependence (instant claim 45; see col. 5, lines 50-54 and 64). Furthermore, Pachter teaches that the naloxone and the analgetic

agents used can include all of the pharmaceutically acceptable nontoxic salts including the hydrochlorides, sulfates, bisulfates, tartrates, nitrates, citrates, bitartrates, phosphates, malates, maleates, hydrobromides, hydroiodides, fumarates, succinates and the like (instant claims 47-48; see col. 4, lines 14-22).

Thus, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to administer the oxycodone-naloxone dosage or particular salts thereof in the formulation of Kaiko et al. in a ratio of 2:1 given that Pachter et al. teach that such ratio provides an effective analgetic composition that negates the euphoria and physical dependence of the composition. Given that Kaiko et al. teach oral dosage sustained release formulation comprising a combination of an orally analgesic effective amount of an opioid agonist and an orally active opioid antagonist provided in a controlled release matrix, and Pachter et al. who teach that an analgesic composition of oxycodone to naloxone or salts thereof in a 2:1 ratio is effective in negating euphoria and physical dependence, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to try such ratio and administer the oxycodone-naloxone or salts thereof in the aforementioned ratio with the reasonable expectation of providing an oral composition that is effective in its analgesic effects but also a composition that negates the euphoric and physical dependence associated with such composition.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samira Jean-Louis whose telephone number is 571-270-3503. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6 PM EST M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. J. L. /

Examiner, Art Unit 1627

09/06/2010

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627